



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/954,772	09/18/2001	Toan Trinh	6009RXD	8802
27752	7590	12/05/2005	EXAMINER	
THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DIVISION WINTON HILL TECHNICAL CENTER - BOX 161 6110 CENTER HILL AVENUE CINCINNATI, OH 45224			HARDEE, JOHN R	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1751		
DATE MAILED: 12/05/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/954,772	TRINH ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	John R. Hardee	1751	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 124 and 125 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 124 and 125 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on November 18, 2005 has been entered.

Double Patenting

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3. Claims 124 and 125 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-5, 11, 28 and 42, at least, of U.S. Patents Nos. 6,323,172 and 6,369,025. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the

'172 recites fabric softening compositions comprising the 7-carbon saturated diols presently claimed. Accordingly, the present claims are anticipated.

4. Claims 124 and 125 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 19, at least, of U.S. Patent No. 5,747,443. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the '443 recites fabric softening compositions comprising the 7-carbon saturated diols presently claimed. Accordingly, the present claims are anticipated.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

6. Claims 124 and 125 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katznellenbogen et al., Martin et al., Eliel et al., and Green et al. for the reasons of record in the previous office action. Katznellenbogen teaches that the disclosed diols are distilled after synthesis, implying transparency. Martin describes diol 13 as pure in the experimental section, implying purification and transparency. Eliel describes the disclosed diol as levorotatory, implying purification and the preparation of a transparent solution.

7. Claims 124 and 125 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over FR 2,540,901. The reference discloses fabric softening compositions which are miscible in all proportions with cold water, implying transparency (p. 1, 1st para.)

Compositions according to the invention comprise 10-50% of a glycol of up to 8 carbons which may be branched or linear (p. 3, lines 23-25.) The specific 7-carbon branched glycols recited by applicant are not disclosed. However, it would have been obvious at the tie that the invention was made to make such diols, because the reference teaches that 7-carbon branched diols generally are useful as solvents for fabric softening compositions.

8. Claims 124 and 125 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over FR 2,540,901 in view of Katznellenbogen et al., Martin et al., Eliel et al., and Green et al. The references are summarized above. The specific 7-carbon branched glycols recited by applicant are not disclosed. However, it would have been obvious at the tie that the invention was made to make such diols, because the reference teaches that 7-carbon branched diols generally are useful as solvents for fabric softening compositions, and the Martin, Eliel and Green references disclose 7-carbon diols which are simple positional isomers of the recited diols.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments regarding transparency or translucency are addressed above.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to the examiner, Dr. John R. Hardee, whose telephone number is (571) 272-1318. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 until 4:30. In the event that the examiner is not available, his

supervisor, Dr. Yogendra Gupta, may be reached at (571) 272-1316.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



John R. Hardee
Primary Examiner
November 30, 2005